

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to better describe the present invention. Support for the amendments can be found on page 4, lines 13-22; page 18, line 27 – page 19, line 2 and claims 3-4. Consequently, claims 3 and 4 are canceled. Claims 5, 7, and 9 have also been amended to better describe embodiments that represent the present invention.

No new matter is submitted. Entry is believed to be proper and respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the amendments, Claims 1-2 and 5-20 are pending.

Rejection under 35 USC 102 over Durr et al.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 13 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 3,692,467 to Durr et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Durr”). Examiner suggests that Durr teaches the limitations of the claims.

It is submitted that Durr teaches a textile treating process using conventional dry cleaning solvent, perchloroethylene, water and other adjuncts. However, the process of the presently claimed invention relates to treating specific lipophilic fluids, which are not taught by Durr. Therefore, Durr does not anticipate the presently claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 102 over Berndt et al.

Claims 1, 2, 4-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,063,135 to Berndt et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Berndt”). Examiner suggests that Berndt teaches the limitations of the claims.

It is submitted that Berndt teaches only a vacuum distillation step after the contaminated silicone solvent has been separated from the fabric articles (Berndt, col. 9, lines 21-28). However, in the presently claimed process, after the emulsion is separated from the fabrics, there are three additional treating steps, including pre-treating the lipophilic fluid from the emulsion, recovering the lipophilic fluid, then purifying the lipophilic fluid. Therefore, Berndt does not anticipate the presently claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Page 7 of 8

Rejection under 35 USC 102 over Murphy

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-13 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,313,079 to Murphy. Examiner suggests that Berndt teaches the limitations of the claims.

It is submitted that Murphy teaches that a dry cleaning machine such as that described in US 4,712,392 to Hagiwara et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hagiwara") can be used. In Hagiwara's apparatus, the used solvent mixture is separated from the fabric articles by two means: centrifugation or vaporization/condensation (Hagiwara, col. 1, lines 39-54). After the used solvent mixture is separated from the fabric articles by the first means, the centrifuged solvent mixture is distilled using distiller 15, condensed by condenser 27, then passes through water separator 22 (Hagiwara, col. 1, lines 62-54). This teaching does not anticipate the presently claimed process because post separation from fabric articles, the presently claimed process contain only one temperature-change step whereas distillation and condensation contain two temperature-change steps. After separation from the fabric articles by the second means, the condensed solvent vapor is delivered to a water separator 22 (Hagiwara, col. 1, lines 39-54). This teaching does not anticipate the presently claimed process because post separation from fabric articles, the presently claimed process contains multiple steps whereas water separator contain only one step. Therefore, Murphy, with the Hagiwara apparatus and/or method incorporated therein, does not anticipate the presently claimed invention.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC 103 over Kilgour et al. in view of Hagiwara

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over US 6,310,029 to Kilgour et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Kilgour") in view of Hagiwara.

Based on the discussion above, it is submitted that the Hagiwara methods do not teach or suggest the multi-step process after the used solvent mixture is separated from the fabric articles. It is further submitted that subjecting Kilgour's compositions to Hagiwara apparatus and methods also fail to teach or suggest the presently claimed process. Therefore, Kilgour and Hagiwara references do not render the presently claimed invention obvious.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Page 8 of 8

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes the present amendment is fully responsive and places Claims 1-2 and 5-20 are in condition for allowance.

In the event that issues remain prior to allowance of the noted claims, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's undersigned attorney to discuss any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,
For: Deak et al.



Caroline Wei-Berk
Reg. No. 45,203
(513) 627-0352

December 7, 2004
Customer No. 27752